

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **October 31, 2003**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-27. Claims 6, 15, and 24 were objected to because of the following informalities: "hexidecimal" should be changed to "hexadecimal." Claims 1-2, 4, 7-11, 13, 16-20, 22, and 25-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kennedy et al. (USPN 5,675,818, hereinafter "Kennedy"). Claims 3, 5-6, 12, 14-15, 21, and 23-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kennedy in view of Davis et al. ("Unicode Technical Standard #10, Unicode Collation Algorithm").

Objections to the claims

Claims 6, 15, and 24 were objected to because of informalities.

Applicant has amended claims 6, 15, and 24 to include the correct spelling of hexadecimal. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 10, and 19 were rejected as being anticipated by Kennedy. Applicant respectfully points out that Kennedy teaches **additional tables** (a 1to2 table and a 2to1 table) to augment the character type table (see Kennedy, col. 9, lines 14-16). These tables constitute additional storage for assigning a collating order for specific characters.

In contrast, the present invention discloses using **additional space in the collating element** for either (1) accent and case information (represented by secondary and tertiary weights) for European languages, or (2) to accommodate a larger number of characters (by increasing the size of the primary weight) for larger non-European character sets (such as Chinese (see page 8, lines 20-25 of the instant application)). This technique saves space by using the same bits for both purposes. There is nothing within Kennedy, either explicit or implicit, which

would suggest using additional space in the collating element for either (1) accent and case information, or (2) to accommodate a larger number of characters.


Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 10, and 19 to include the limitations of dependent claims 4, 13, and 22, respectively, to clarify that the present invention uses additional space in the collating element for either (1) accent and case information, or (2) to accommodate a larger number of characters. These amendments find support on page 8, lines 20-25 of the instant application. Dependent claims 4, 13, and 22 have been canceled without prejudice.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 10, and 19 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-3 and 5-9, which depend upon claim 1, claims 11-12 and 14-18, which depend upon claim 10, and claims 20—21 and 23-27, which depend upon claim 19, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47, 615

Date: November 14, 2003

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665